

Mr Charlesworth

"THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE YOU FREE."—CHRIST.

The Christian Freeman.

A Monthly Unitarian Journal.

DEVOTED TO RELIGIOUS, MORAL, AND SOCIAL PROGRESS.

With an Eight Page Supplement of "RECORD OF UNITARIAN WORTHIES."

No. 9.—VOL. XIX.]

SEPTEMBER, 1875. [NEW SERIES.—PRICE 1½d.

Notes of the Month.

HOME AND ABROAD.

STROUD.—A new Unitarian chapel is in the course of erection at Stroud. It will cost over £1200.

PREJUDICE.—As soon as Mr. Sankey found that the hymn "Nearer, my God, to Thee," was composed by a Unitarian, he left it out of his hymn-book.

SCHOOL-BOARD PRAYERS.—One of the London School-Board teachers was recently urged to adopt an orthodox prayer instead of the Lord's Prayer in the school. The Board last month questioned him about the change. He expressed his willingness to pray any way they pleased to direct him, for he had no scruples on such matters. He reminded us of another would-be school teacher, who recently replied to a question by one of the examiners: "Do you think the world round or flat?" by saying, "Well, some people think one way and some another, and I'll teach round or flat, just as the parents please."

THE DEATH OF M. COQUEREL OF PARIS.—We have this month to record one of the greatest losses to the Unitarians of France—the death of Athanase Coquerel, at the age of fifty-seven. Notices of this distinguished man appeared in all the London papers. All spoke well of him. The *Standard* said: "The death of M. Athanase Coquerel has thrown a gloom over Protestant circles in Paris, where, even by those who lamented his secession from the regular Church, he was looked up to with a feeling of reverence and affection which few men, except, perhaps, the late Mr. Robertson, ever succeeded in securing. He was one of the most eloquent men that ever entered a pulpit, and his sermons and speeches will survive as long as the French language. His death was announced from the pulpit yesterday by M. le Pasteur Dide at the Salle St. André, and was received with an explosion of grief which showed how deep a hold he had on the hearts of his flock."

THE BIBLE IN FRANCE.—The Liberal Protestants (Unitarians) in France are about to publish, in six volumes, a Bible Commentary, translated from the Dutch. They have done much to circulate the Bible among their countrymen. They feel its value.

THE MISSION OF SUFFERING.—The one plausible argument of Orthodoxy against Universalism—and we can think of but one that really has any plausibility—is in this form: If God, consistently with His wisdom and goodness, can permit sin and suffering in time, why not throughout eternity? Between the two is there anything more than the difference of degree? The Universalist reply is: Temporary evil may be overruled for good; endless evil is essentially evil. The distinction is vital, yet we seldom get an opponent to "see the point." But a late writer in the *Christian Era* incidentally recognises it, and "puts" it well. He says: "Whatever suffering God might see to be needful for our sanctification might properly be prayed for even though it were far beyond our present power of thought to conceive in severity."

FEAR IN RELIGION.—In our last issue we showed how fear made converts in the East. The following we take from a Western paper, and it is in remarkable harmony with the course said to be followed in Russia, in one case by the Government, in this latter by the mother of a family:—"An Iowa woman went to a revival meeting one Sunday a short time ago, and got 'converted,' and 'experienced religion,' so that she was full of it as an egg is full of meat. Arriving home she called her children round her and shouted 'Glory to God,' saying, 'Children, look here. I've got religion; I am pious; I love my Jesus, and you've got to love Jesus too, and I'll give you just two days to do it in, and if you don't shout glory to God in that time, I'll take that rod you see hanging up there and I'll jist skin you alive.' They were all pious, and loved Jesus, and shouted glory before the given time expired."

THE FRENCH LIBERAL CHRISTIANS.—It is thought that M. Jalabert, the Senior Professor of Law at Nancy, may now be regarded as the leader of the French Liberals.

UNUSUAL.—We are glad to record the fact that two Congregational ministers conducted recently the Unitarian Sunday-school anniversary services at Longton, Staffordshire. May such friendships increase.

FRENCH UNITARIANS.—If the Government persist in refusing to recognise the Liberal Christians of France it is said that they will organise an independent "Unitarian Christian Church," and give it this name. We trust they will do so.

CRUCIFYING GOD.—Mr. Spurgeon says in sermon 1239:—"Sin has been at the bottom of all human sorrows; but the crowning culminating point of sin's villainy was when God himself came down to earth in human form—pure, perfect, intent on an errand of love, came to work miracles of mercy and redemption. Then sinful man could never rest till he had crucified his incarnate God." This surely needs no refutation.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.—The Rev. D. Moore, of Holy Trinity, Paddington, recently said, "There is a great deal of *loose thinking* abroad in the present day. I suspect the outcry against the Athanasian Creed masks more of covert infidelity than we are aware of." The rector of Paddington is of a different opinion from that of Macedonius, a former bishop of Constantinople, who, when he first heard the Athanasian Creed, thought it "the production of a drunken man."

MR. MOODY AND UNITARIANISM.—Robert Collyer, of Chicago, says: "Mr. Moody told me once he was raised an Unitarian, and he says that he learnt nothing from us of the Gospel. The truth is he learnt nothing else from us but the Gospel, and that is what makes him so shy of these harsh and bitter things that would deform and defile it; he can no more shake off the sweet, pure nurture of our faith in the fatherhood of God, than he can shake off his own manhood. Sir David Brewster brought a curious stone once to a meeting of philosophers, a gem in which a photograph had been taken by a natural process; then the stone was buried, and when it came up again into the sun, and Brewster found it, the picture came gradually out of its heart, but in the dark it would disappear. It is the secret of all that is most tender and humane in Brother Moody's gospel—the old picture is still there, caught in those years and hidden in his heart for ever. He cannot part with his birthright."

SOMETHING DREADFUL.—We have heard that at a meeting of ministers, an opinion was expressed that the Congregationalists are stepping toward rationalism, and that they are bordering on the slough of Unitarianism or something else.

HALF A MILLION.—Mr. John H. Towne, a member of the Unitarian church of Philadelphia, has left legacies to the amount of nearly half a million pounds sterling for various educational and charitable institutions of America.

MINISTERS' FAMILIES.—In considering a popular fallacy, Rev. Dr. Miner says that of several hundred Universalist ministers' families with which he is acquainted, not more than four or five members have "turned out bad;" he presumes that an extended examination would bring out a similar favourable report concerning the families of ministers of other denominations.

THE LAST REQUEST OF M. COQUEREL was that he should be buried in the Cemetery at Fismes. It appears that the Roman Catholics have frequently refused Protestants the rights of burial there against French law. M. Coquerel justly assumed they dare not refuse this to his body. So his last thoughts were for others, for henceforth they cannot refuse the burial of any one, however humble, because of Protestantism, after this ultra Protestant has been interred. He was buried at Fismes without objection, otherwise he would have been buried in Paris.

ROMANISM AND SCEPTICISM ALLIES.—Mr. Gladstone writes to M. de Laveleye as one "who is too acute either to undervalue the power and fixed intentions of the Ultramontane conspiracy, or to find comfort in the visionary notion that any security is afforded to European society against that conspiracy by any system of mere negations in religion. This last-named error is widely prevalent in England. There is an impression, which is not worthy to be called a conviction, but which holds the place of one, that the indifferentism, scepticism, materialism, and pantheism which for the moment are so fashionable, afford among them an effectual defence against Vaticanism. But one has truly said that the votaries of that system have three elements of real strength, namely, faith, self-sacrifice, and the spirit of continuity. None of the three are to be found in any of the negative systems, and you have justly and forcibly pointed out that these systems, through the feelings of repugnance and alarm which they excite in many religious minds, are effectual allies of the Romanism of the day."

VERY CONSIDERATE.—At one of the revival meetings a speaker said "he had come 4000 miles to attend the meeting, and that prayer was going up all over America for London." Very considerate!

ENGLISH HOSPITALITY.—An American paper says:—"All of our ministers who visit England speak of Rev. W. H. Channing's greeting and attentions as among their greatest pleasures abroad. We are told that he seems 'just like his old self, and speaks as freshly as he did long years ago.' As to proffers of hospitality, he tells his countrymen: 'Accept all offers that are made. Englishmen mean just what they say, and expect to have their offers accepted.'"

DR. CHANNING.—The *Methodist Quarterly Review* says: "Such a man as Dr. Channing must have stood majestically in advance of his age, whenever and wherever he had lived. He lived, according to the sense of the present generation, at least, in the best age of the world, and yet was far in front of it. If it reaches his radiant position in two centuries, the signs of the times are certainly quite illusive." We think there are signs that this age aspires after the Christianity taught by Channing. Five thousand ministers in Great Britain are studying his sermons.

THE SCAVENGER OF THE UNIVERSE.—A revival preacher (Mr. Taylor, of California) recently described in London the fate of the sinner in the following words: "What could God do with the sinner but deliver him over to the scavenger of the universe, the *Devil*, to take him off to Gehenna, the place of Nuisances." We presume, as public officials are now trying to utilise the refuse of the land, might we not without presumption suppose that something better may be done with bad people than that of keeping them in an endless hell? This never seems to strike the revivalist minister.

ELOHIM.—A controversy has been recently held in the *Rock* about Elohim, supposed to be an argument in favour of the Trinity. One gentleman writes:—"I cannot agree with Mr. Beddoes' statements, as far as I can understand them. He thinks *Elohim* ought to be translated 'gods,' but, says Moses, 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.' According to Mr. Beddoes, Gen. ii. 1 ought to be, 'The gods rested from all *their* work,' but the Hebrew is '*His* work.' I love the doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity, but always to extract it from the word *Elohim* is a great mistake. Neither the Septuagint, nor the Vulgate, nor the English version do so; it is generally fairly translated 'God.'"

A CONCESSION.—An Orthodox paper admits "that one well-rooted in the truth may find Channing's works a positive addition to his library."

DR. GANNETT'S LIFE.—A Methodist paper, the *Watchman and Reflector*, says:—"We doubt if any man, orthodox or liberal, can rise from the perusal of the 'Life of Dr. Gannett,' just published by Roberts Brothers, without feeling himself benefited thereby. The book is the story of a man of sincere purpose, and as a biography is simply admirable."

THE HIGHEST TYPE OF LIFE.—The *Westminster* is not much addicted to superstition, yet it says:—"The life of Jesus will always supply the highest type of love of the ideal and of duty; it is a proof that the highest standard is not practically unattainable; and his consciousness of communion with the Supreme Will is to a religious mind a strong confirmation of spiritual theism."

PLEASING SIGNS.—Within the memory of some Unitarians now living not only the religious but the secular papers carefully abstained from noticing their meetings. At the present time two religious papers, the *Christian World* and the *Christian Union*, both of them have weekly notices of Unitarian movements. The *Times* newspaper and the *Hour* recently gave considerable accounts of the Unitarian meetings in London.

THE REV. MISS TURNER.—This lady has been for a few years the minister of the Unitarian church at Melbourne, Australia. The *Melbourne Leader* has a lengthened sketch of her and her preaching, and concludes thus:—"Of Miss Turner's Sunday administration in the Eastern-hill Church it is not saying too much to conclude that her congregation have in her a keen inquiring thinker and preacher, and one who is not afraid to acknowledge her susceptibility to the liberal influences around her, from whatsoever quarter they may come."

TRUE CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.—The *Christian Registrar* has the following:—"The fire at the Unitarian church at Harvard was first discovered by members of the Orthodox society. Headed by the minister and deacon they rushed to the burning building, and did all that could be done to save the movable property. In the evening the use of their church on Sunday afternoons was offered to the Unitarians. Both congregations attend morning and afternoon, and their ministers unite in the services. The fire seems to have melted many strong prejudices, besides sending a glow of Christian love throughout the town."

A WONDERFUL CHARACTER.

LADY HESTER STANHOPE, who some years ago created such a sensation in the world by her self-banishment to the East, was certainly a very contradictory, yet very remarkable personage. She was the daughter of Charles, Earl of Stanhope, and of Hester, sister of Mr. William Pitt, and daughter of the first Earl of Chatham.

In her own composition seemed to be mingled the aristocracy of her father's family (though he himself was a Republican), and the talent of her mother's.

Mr. Pitt's appreciation of her ability is shown very forcibly, when, in the midst of his political career, he said to her: "I have plenty of good diplomats, but they are none of them military men; and I have plenty of good officers, but not one of them is worth sixpence in the Cabinet. If you were a man, Hester, I would send you on the Continent with sixty thousand men, and give you *carte blanche*; and I am sure that not one of my plans would fail, and that not one soldier would go with his shoes unblackened."

Her mother died when she was quite a child, and she and her two sisters were left almost entirely to English and French governesses, who did not seem to exert any direct influence over them, so that they probably brought themselves up. Their father married again, but the second Lady Stanhope was so devoted to the routine of fashionable life in London, that she had no time to become much acquainted with the children, and one of them made the remark that if she saw her stepmother in the street she should not know her.

Notwithstanding the apparent coldness and indifference of this second mother, the little Hester evidently had a very friendly feeling towards her. When her father became very radical in his democratic principles, in order, as he thought, to carry them out very thoroughly, he parted with his carriage and horses, which was quite a blow to Lady Stanhope, who depended on them for much of her comfort.

Hester, seeing how matters stood, immediately provided herself with a pair of stilts, and, mounted on them,

paraded around through a very muddy lane. Her father, as she expected, witnessed the performance, and when he inquired into the meaning of it, she told him she did not mind the mud very much, as she could go through it on stilts, but poor Lady Stanhope! what was she to do! This suggested a carriage and horses to the Earl, and they were sent down, "and thus," as she says, "by a little innocent frolic I made all happy again."

Soon after she was grown she went to live with her uncle, Mr. Pitt, and while there was in a continual whirl of society. She encountered many of the most distinguished persons of her day, but from her own account of herself, was never in the least disconcerted or embarrassed by any of them.

She must have been somewhat of the grenadier order as to height, for her physician, who seemed to follow her fortunes with astonishing pertinacity and devotion, said of her, that "she was nearly six feet; she was largely proportioned, majestic looking, in conversation fascinating, courageous, and proud."

Sir Sydney Smith said to her, after her looks were much changed by illness, "When I see you I now recall to my recollection what you were when you first came out. You entered the room exciting our admiration by your magnificent and majestic figure. The roses and lilies were blended in your face, and the ineffable smiles of your countenance diffused happiness around you."

She herself said, addressing her physician, "Doctor, at twenty my complexion was like alabaster; and at five paces distant the sharpest eye could not discover my pearl necklace from my skin; my lips were of such a beautiful carnation that, without vanity, I can assure you very few women had the like."

After reading this opinion of herself, so freely expressed, we certainly would not consider modesty a very striking element in her peculiar character.

After the death of Mr. Pitt she lived with her two brothers a short time, but though she had an annuity of twelve hundred pounds a year given to her by the expressed will of Mr. Pitt on

his deathbed, she was not satisfied. This sum did not allow of the style to which she had been accustomed, and her pride being greater than her purse, she concluded to leave England.

She started on her travels in 1810, went to Gibraltar and remained there for some time, and then pursued her journey to the East. After many wanderings she finally settled at Dar Joon, at Mt. Lebanon; there she lived, in the midst of a nest of buildings and underground passages, surrounded by a wall, and prepared for any emergencies of any description.

Various additions were made from time to time to this curiously-contrived abode; according to her physician, not because she enjoyed indulging in an outlay for brick and mortar, but because she always wanted to afford shelter to the needy and distressed, who would fly to her for protection from the reigning tyrants.

She enjoyed vastly the position of Lady Bountiful to the neighbourhood, and with all her oddities and violent temper, she was ever ready to relieve others. Even in the latter part of her life, when the income she had so freely devoted to others was cut off through some political manœuvre, and she was left in comparative poverty, she would generously give what she actually needed for her own pressing wants.

At one time, when she had only twenty pounds (two thousand piastres) on hand with which to maintain her numerous household for two months, she gave one hundred and fifty piastres to a poor leper, and the same amount to a distressed shopkeeper, besides smaller sums to various others.

Stories were circulated in regard to her wealth and her style of living which had no foundation in truth. She was not penurious. She never hoarded up her money, and lived very economically in her own personal expenses, though surrounded by a multitude of servants, whom she managed to keep in active service day and night. Her rooms were bare, and her table exceedingly plain.

She could not abide the indolence so peculiar to Eastern people, and her servants she punished in the most sum-

mary manner. She used to boast that no one could give such a slap of the face as herself. Often her ingenuity was taxed to invent some new punishment for those who were rebellious beyond endurance. One day when her servants were robbing her right and left, which they always contrived to do every chance they got, she ordered a carpenter to set two stakes in the yard, such as are used in the East for impaling. She said nothing to any one in regard to it, giving no reason for such an extraordinary command. The whole household was perfectly convulsed with fear, and it was astonishing how well her maids behaved after that for months.

She was a model of courage, even in the midst of a deceitful, unprincipled set, who could have poisoned her or cut her throat with very little compunction, if she had not exercised a wonderful power over them by reason of her fearlessness. She would have made an admirable Amazon, for she was exceedingly fond of wielding weapons. Her favourite one was the mace, which was spiked round the head, and was very formidable in appearance. This, with a steel battle-axe and dagger, she always had on hand. When she wielded her mace her servants were quite terrified, and would draw back to be out of reach of her arm.

One day a Turk, a powerful-looking man, was in her presence, and on her making a gesture as if to strike him, though there had been no provocation, he flew back so suddenly that he knocked over some one behind him, and then fell on the floor himself. Of course Lady Hester must have found very keen enjoyment in this acknowledgment of her power.

She had a rather terrible neighbour in the person of the Emir Beshyr. He was noted for his atrocities in every direction; he thought nothing of putting out the eyes of those who were obnoxious to him, or of making away with them in some covert manner. He did not like the idea of Lady Hester's residence in his territory, and harassed her in as many ways as possible in the hope of getting rid of her. She detested him, and when he sent one of his emis-

saries to insinuate the peril to which she exposed herself in persisting in her hostility to so powerful a prince, she requested the messenger to tell his master that she knew very well that there was not a more profound and bloody tyrant on the face of the earth; that she was aware no one was safe from his poisons and daggers, but that she held him in the most sovereign contempt, and set him at defiance. "Tell him," she added, "that he is a dog and a monster, and that if he means to try his strength with me, I am ready."

One of Lady Hester's hobbies was medicine, and in regard to it she was very self-willed and opinionated, as she was on all subjects to which she gave any attention. Her house was stocked with herbs and roots and dried plants, and she seemed to go upon the general principle that if a little was good, a great deal was better. If she found anything that soothed her cough she sent off immediately to Beyrout for an immense quantity of it; or if unable to obtain it there, to Europe. Of Epsom salts she had a cask-full the size of a firkin. If she had confined all these nauseous doses to herself, no one would have had any reason certainly to complain. But woe unto any luckless traveller who might happen to be taken slightly ill while under her roof. She paid no attention whatever to the wishes of her guests in respect to medicine, but instantly prepared her dose and insisted on its being taken.

Prince Prickler Muskan, who stopped to pay his respects to her, was taken ill, and immediately her favourite black dose was ready, and he was forced to swallow it. He grumbled somewhat afterwards about it, but the fact of his actually taking it shows the influence she exerted over even one of his rank.

Among the many absurd stories published in regard to Lady Hester was that concerning her manner of living. It was said by many who certainly knew very little of what they affirmed, that she lived like an Eastern queen, in the greatest magnificence.

In reality, her apartments were scantily furnished and very bare-looking. Her bedstead was nothing but two planks nailed together, on low

tressles. A wooden stool near her bed served as a table, on which was placed at night lemonade or some other light drink, with which she generally regaled herself. Her washing apparatus—a small copper basin and an earthenware jug—stood in one of the windows. There were no curtains to the windows, but near the foot of the bed was an upright walnut box with a piece of green calico hanging before it, which probably served as a curtain to protect her from the air.

Her dress, which was in reality that of a Turkish gentleman, was evidently chosen with great care, and with an eye to the picturesque. Her turban was cream-coloured, wound loosely around a red fez or tarboosh. She wore scarlet pantaloons, a crimson robe underneath her cloak, and yellow leather stockings, which slipped into yellow slippers. No pearls or precious stones adorned her, as she lost all her jewels when she was shipwrecked on one of her voyages.

She said in regard to her dress:—"I think I look something like those sketches of Guercinos, where you see scratches and touches of the pen round the heads and persons of his figures, so that you don't know whether it is hair or a turban, a sleeve or an arm, a mantle or a veil which he has given them."

In the latter part of her life, when her pension was stopped, and she lived in penury, she delighted in rags, though her dress was always scrupulously clean.

Her pride never seemed to desert her under any circumstances. Indeed, the intensity of that quality was probably the reason of her waging a continual warfare with every member of her household, with her physician, whom she evidently considered her truest friend, and with the Government of England and its officers in the East, to whom she was continually sending the most sarcastic letters.

Her religious views were a queer mixture of heathen notions, with a few correct ideas of the Supreme Being which she had received at home.

She used to say: "What my religion is nobody knows. Jews and Christians have tried me hard and questioned me pretty closely, but they were not wiser when they ended than when they began."

She believed in demonology and witchcraft to some extent, but also professed to put implicit confidence in the Bible, which she is said to have read more than any other book.

She was a victim to consumption during the greater part of her residence abroad, and no doubt her sufferings from disease, and the insults, real or fancied, which she received in England, contributed to make her temper still more violent than it was naturally.

With all her failings she had some noble traits of character, and if she had been blessed with proper training in childhood, when she was so neglected and uncared for, she might have developed into a very different woman.

In June, 1839, her life of disappointment and turmoil was over. She died with no one near her but her servants, in the midst of poverty and loneliness, a sad ending of a sad life.

ELMER LYNNDE.

BETTER TO WHISTLE THAN WHINE.

It is better to whistle than whine ;

It is better to laugh than to cry,
For though it be cloudy, the sun will soon shine

Across the blue, beautiful sky.

It is better to whistle than whine,

Oh, man with the sorrowful brow,
Let the words of the child scatter murmurs of thine,

And gather his cheerfulness now.

It is better to whistle than whine,

Poor mother ! so weary with care,
Thank God for the love and peace that is thine,

And the joy of thy little ones share.

It is better to whistle than whine,

Though troubles you find on your way,
Remember that, fair boy of mine,
And whistle your whining away.

God bless that brave boy for the cheer

He brought to this sad heart of mine

When tempted to murmur, that young voice I hear,

"It is better to whistle than whine !"

MABEL HOWARD.

AN ODD QUESTION.—"Are the Bishops Mad?" This is a curious title for "a Clergyman of the Established Church" to prefix to a pamphlet that he has published in the form of "A Letter to John Bright"—the more so when we find it is a High Churchman who has got hold of the pen!

NOT TO BE FOUND IN THE BIBLE.

THE Bible contains many valuable truths and beautiful thoughts full of sweetness and comfort; but there are other things which many people suppose it contains which are not to be found there.

For instance, the Bible *does not* contain any of the following expressions:—

Trinity, triune God, God-man, Adam's fall, free agency, total depravity, original sin, infinite sin, unpardonable sin, finally impenitent, vindictive justice, the last judgment, eternal death, endless death, eternal hell, endless hell, endless misery.

Nor any of the following phrases:— Forgiveness of punishment, changed from nature to grace, day of probation, probationers for eternity, sinned away the day of grace, dropping from time into eternity, everlastingly too late, the door of mercy shut, the death that never dies.

Nor any of the following texts:— As a man thinketh, so is he (Prov. xxiii. 6, 7.) The prayers of the wicked are an abomination to the Lord (see Prov. xv. 8, 9, 26; xxi. 27, and xxviii. 9.) As death leaves us, so judgment will find us. Arise ye dead, and come to judgment. If ye die in your sins, where God and Christ are ye never can come. God, out of Christ, is a consuming fire. There is no change after death.

Nor any of the following statements:— That God created a place called hell, not included in "the heaven and earth" mentioned in the first verse of Genesis. That "the serpent" mentioned in the third chapter of Genesis, as the tempter of our first mother, was a fallen angel, or the residence of such a being. That Adam was constituted the federal head or representative of the whole human family, and his sin imputed to each individual. That Christ suffered, in the stead of mankind, the penalty due to them for Adam's sin. That Christ will, by and by, leave the mercy seat, and take the judgment seat. That there is no judgment in the earth. That the devil or his works shall forever exist.

A SERMON FOR THE LITTLE FOLKS.

"If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."—John xiii. 17.

FIRST.—"These things"—that is, your duties. You have duties wherever you are.

1.—*At home*, obedience and respect to parents, and kindness to brothers, sisters, and servants.

2.—*At school*, respect to teacher, faithfulness in study, fairness in play.

3.—*At church*, be quiet, listen, worship, and give your hearts to the Saviour.

4.—*On the street*, good manners, modesty, kindness, minding your own business.

Second.—How should you do your duty?

1.—*Not for pay*. That is a low motive. Some always ask, "What will you give me?"

2.—*But from love*. So the Saviour did when a boy at Nazareth. So the angels do God's will (which is only another name for duty). This will make you do it cheerfully.

3.—*Better every day*. By trying to do your duties you will become more skilful. So you improve in reading, writing, and music. Peter says, "Grow in grace."

Third.—Doing duty makes you happy. Sin cannot make you happy. Sin did not make Eve happy, nor Cain nor Judas. Disobedience at home does not make you happy; idleness, unkindness, bad manners, no kind of sin can make you happy.

But happiness comes from doing your duty. This is God's reward. This is the promise in the text. Think of this every day for just one week, and see how true it is.

Every one is wanting to be happy, and yet, how few are really happy. It is because they are not wise: they seek happiness more than the knowledge of duty.

Try, then, to know your duty. Be faithful to duty in doing it from love to God and man; then you will be happy every day on earth, and forever happy in the kingdom of God.—*Sel.*

CARRYING A LADDER.

A LESSON FOR THE YOUNG.

DID you ever see a person carry a ladder? He puts it on his shoulder, or, it may be, he puts his head between the rounds, and has one of the sides resting on each shoulder, and having it nicely balanced, walks along. A man with a ladder is an interesting object in a crowded street. He looks at the end before him, but the end behind him he cannot see. If he moves the front end to get out of the way of a person, away goes the rear end just as far in the opposite direction, and the slightest turn of his body, only a few inches, will give the ends a sweep of several feet, and those in the way may look for bruised heads, while the window glass along the street is in continual danger from the unseen rear end of the ladder.

When a small boy, I was carrying not a very large ladder, when there was a crash. An unlucky movement had brought the rear end of my ladder against a window. Instead of scolding me, my father made me stop, and said very quietly:

"Look here, my son, there is one thing I wish you always to remember; that is, every ladder has two ends."

I never have forgotten that, though many, many years have gone, and I never see a man carrying a ladder or other long thing, but what I remember the two ends. Don't we carry things besides ladders that have two ends? When I see a young man getting "fast" habits, I think he only sees one end of that ladder, and that he does not know that the other end is wounding his parent's heart.

Many a girl carries a ladder in the shape of love for dress and finery; she only sees the gratification of a foolish pride at the forward end of that ladder, while the end that she does not see is crushing true modesty and pure friendship as she goes along thoughtlessly among the crowd.

Do not forget this fact; it may save many a crash in more places than the street.

Ah, yes, every ladder has two ends, and it is a thing to be remembered in more ways than one.—*Moravian.*

A CAMBRIDGE SCHOLAR ON
THE TRINITY.

PART I.

WE reproduce some passages from a clever and now scarce pamphlet, the authorship of which is involved in mystery. In 1798 Granville Sharp published his "Remarks on the Greek Article," in which he endeavoured to introduce a new theory of its grammatical use, and by the new meaning which would thus be given to many texts he made out "many new proofs of the divinity of Christ." In 1802 Dr. Christopher Wordsworth took up the theory, and advocated it in his "Six Letters to Granville Sharp." In the spring of 1803 a reply to both these pamphlets appeared, entitled, "Six More Letters to Granville Sharp, by Gregory Blunt,"—a name evidently framed in imitation of his opponent's. The book—it consisted of nearly 200 pages—reminded its readers of Porson's "Letters to Archdeacon Travis" (on the Three Heavenly Witnesses), and was loudly declared to be Porson's. The writer of the "Short Account of Porson" thought the style so like the Professor's that he felt "constrained to say either Blunt writes like Porson, or Porson writes like Blunt." Porson's intimate friend Maltby says that the Professor used to praise the work, and recommend it to his friends. When Porson, moreover, was asked his opinion of Sharp's rule, "he intimated distrust of it, and assigned such reasons for his distrust as appeared decisive to those that could judge of them" (Kidd, Tracts, p. 301). Again, the copy preserved in the University Library at Cambridge belonged to Dr. Wordsworth, and was given to him by Sharp; in it Porson's name is added as the author, in a pencil note on the title-page. But Dr. Wordsworth, in the preface to his "Who Wrote Icon Basilike?" assures us that Porson spoke to him on the subject and denied the authorship. The statement is so explicit that it seems impossible to question its conclusiveness. Indeed, to us the style of the book seems quite distinct from Porson's; the writer's confidence, love of satire, and proneness to Shakespearian quotations, remind us of him; but the terseness, irony, and

caution of the "Letters to Travis" are not to be found in Blunt. Indeed, Maltby (whom we have quoted above) says, "I do not believe Porson was the author, but I have little doubt he gave assistance to the author, particularly in the notes." Yet if it were not Porson, who was it? Mr. J. S. Watson, in his "Life of Porson" (pp. vii, 267) tells us, on the authority of Rev. James Yates, that "one of Dr. Disney's daughters believed it was written by an intimate friend of her father's—Thomas Pearne, Fellow and Tutor of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, a Unitarian and a good classical scholar. Dr. Disney himself knew who wrote it, but would not tell; but she felt sure she was right as to the author."

It is not noticed by any critic of the book that it claims to be a *joint* production (pp. iv. and 171); the writer of the Preface being only "editor" of the Letters. Now this fits in curiously with the only other fact that we know of Mr. Pearne, namely, that when Robert Aspland ("Life," p. 129) met him four months after the publication of Gregory Blunt's book, he was travelling in company with a Mr. Browne, a Unitarian, who also had been a Fellow of St. Peter's College.

The work has been recently recalled to public notice by Sir Henry Holland, who, in his "Recollections of Past Life" (p. 269), says, "I recollected to have been much interested by a book written under the name of Gregory Blunt, but attributed to Porson, and bearing many marks of his caustic talent."

We now quote some passages from the "Letters," slightly abridged and rearranged:—

THE LETTERS.

We know the reply to the question, "Where was your religion before Luther?" It was where it now is—in the Bible; and consistent Christians and consistent Protestants will never look for it elsewhere. We have often been told "these things are mysteries," but the answer is sufficient, "Where mystery begins, religion ends."

It would indeed be very extraordinary if the absolute unity of the Deity, proclaimed by the confession of all nature, and by the concurring tenor of

the Jewish and Christian revelations, could be affected by the fanciful or forced construction of a few scattered passages of the Christian Scriptures. It is by these misconstructions that divines have so greatly impeded the Gospel of Christ from having its free course, and from working conviction on the minds of sceptics and unbelievers, and have precluded it from having its proper effect on the hearts and lives of mankind. In direct violation of the repeated declarations of our humble Master, many of his disciples still contend, and in some cases contend with much unchristianlike violence, that our Lord Jesus Christ, who was born of woman and had not where to lay his head—who increased in wisdom as he grew in stature—who suffered death and was buried—is God.

I am indeed persuaded that the Christian world will some day witness the abandonment of the exploded arguments and all the various inventions and ingenuities of the defenders of our several prejudices. But in the meantime, and while the reproach of "impiety" is often applied to the worshippers of one God, it is well to consider whether the reproach of *Idolatry* does not apply to any worship that unites any other being, as an object of religious homage, to the peerless and unrivalled majesty of the One only true God.

From the principles of our common Master, who allows the fullest latitude of inquiry about doctrines, we professing Christians are to allow each other our diversities of opinion, and to love each other unfeignedly as fellow-creatures of the same God and fellow disciples of the same Master. For Christian love, cultivated in the mind and exhibited in practice, is the best evidence of any man's fulfilling the Christian law.

Practical Christianity, which alone Jesus and his apostles ever put into their religion, is the only genuine Christianity. It cannot be described in fewer or better words than those of the apostle, "*The cross of Christ*;" and it consists in crucifying our appetites and being dead unto sin. This Christianity was so plain and simple, and had so little to do with learned systems, dis-

putes, and controversies, that it seemed "foolishness" to the Greeks of old, and foolishness it still continues to seem to many modern Greeks and disputing theologians of our own day. Yet this Christianity you and I, and all of us, understand well enough, because the true religion of Jesus is so plain that no one ever did or could misunderstand it; though none of us cultivate it as we should do, and for that reason alone we have so much misery among us, and shall continue to have, until our Christianity be more in our hearts and less in our heads.

But there is also a *theoretical* Christianity, which many suppose to be the Christianity of the Scriptures, but which has nothing of Christianity about it beyond the name. I mean the motley Christianity which men fabricate by sewing bits and scraps of texts together (as some have made a history of the Jews out of Homer); a Christianity which must be dug out of Greek articles and Hebrew plurals, and such dark recesses as no Christian would ever think of groping in for "the light of the world," unless he were so hoodwinked by the nursery, the Church, or the State, as to be quite blind to the broad religion of the Bible. A man can't know much about the Greek article nor about Christianity who dreams of looking for the latter in the former. We are told that apostolical Christianity—which is, to this, Hyperion to a satyr—was "not hidden in a corner" (Acts xxvi. 26); but this theology of shreds and patches is to be found nowhere in the Bible but in holes and corners. It is only "by observing times* and using enchantments and witchcraft†, and by dealing with familiar spirits and wizards"‡ (2 Chron. xxxiii. 6) that the theologian drags it forth to view. Yet even then it comes reluctantly and by inches, and appears in such a questionable shape that if a Christian can but muster up courage to

* To make out the rites and discipline of particular feasts and fasts.

† Juggling with names and titles and attributes, "persons" and "natures," &c. &c.

‡ The "subtle doctors," "deep divines," and "systematic expositors" of the ignorant and corrupt ages, many of whose mystical mummeries are still current among us.

look it steadily in the face, he will soon see what an unsubstantial, visionary form it is, and will behold it instantly shrink from his sight; and if he will but pursue it with a fearless eye, will find it vanish into air, "and what seemed corporal melt as breath into the wind." Let him but follow the apostle's advice (1 Cor. xiv. 20), and not be, what the generality of Christians are upon all questions of this sort, *children*, afraid to use their understandings; but let him be upon this, as upon every other matter that concerns his religion, though a child in malice yet a man in understanding, and he will see that all *theoretical* Christianity is man's device, the mere coinage of the brain, the "trumpery of fathers and councils,"* of theologians and schoolmen, of "eremites and friars, white, black, and grey." The Bible is so plain and full from one end of it to the other for the unity of the Deity; it denies so expressly the doctrine of a Trinity, declaring that no person whatever but the *Father* of Jesus is the true God (John xvii. 1-3), that almost any way-faring man, arrived at years of maturity, reading it according to the apostle's rules (1 Cor. xiv. 20, 1 Thess. v. 21), would find it more than a match for infant prejudices.

Dr. Randolph, Professor of Divinity at Oxford, in his "Vindication of the Trinity," in reply to Bishop Clayton's "Essay on Spirit," declared that "The divinity of Jesus is rather *strongly intimated* than *plainly taught*" in the Scriptures, "because Jesus found himself obliged to speak and act with great caution and reserve." To which a reviewer says, "What? Caution and reserve in a point of such vast importance? And is an *intimation* sufficient to prove a doctrine that is of so difficult and abstruse, and withal of so important a nature?"

The Papists have not only confessed,

* Of all the writers of antiquity that have reached our time, there are none which are so much disfigured and obscured by interpolations and corruptions of all sorts as the Fathers. Unless they be read with a constant and vigilant attention to this circumstance, they will be read to little profit or purpose. [This point Blunt explains and discusses at considerable length].

but contended that the Trinity cannot be proved from Scripture. And there is not a text of any consequence in the Unitarian controversy that has not been given up by some one or more of the principal critics among the Trinitarians; so that among them they have given away the victory to their adversaries. The Unitarian controversialists have challenged Trinitarians to point out a single one that has not been so given up; but the challenge, made at the close of the seventeenth century, has never been answered. (Unitarian Tracts, i. Brief History, 12, 45; ii. Tract i. p. 3, Tract last, p. 30; iii. Tract viii. 35.)

Mr. Hawkins, the Bampton Lecturer for 1787, speaking of the divinity of Jesus, says (p. 59), "If this doctrine was the doctrine of the Church, previously to the publication of the Scriptures, they are sufficiently full and explicit for the satisfaction or confirmation of Christians of all ages; if otherwise, here" [*i. e.*, in the Scriptures] "is more than enough to perplex and misguide them, and to lead them into errors of the first magnitude."

Could then this reverend gentleman believe that such a revolution in the sentiments of the first Christians as this could take place, and leave no trace behind it? A revolution more astonishing than any that the world ever witnessed! Can we believe that the disciples of Jesus should converse with him as a mere man, should see him live and die like a man, and afterwards be thus completely settled in the persuasion of his being the Almighty God, without leaving behind them so much as a hint about the transition of their minds from one opinion to the other, and without taking the least notice of the means by which a change so amazing was produced? To find *him* to be God, whom they had supposed to be a man, must have excited the most astonishing emotions of wonder and surprise, must have filled their minds with most solemn awful thought. And can it be supposed, that not a syllable should be recorded of such a total alteration of opinion, nor of the cause which produced it, nor of the sensations which it occasioned? Or can it be supposed,

that if these things had ever been recorded, all records of them should be so entirely lost as not to leave behind so much as a memorial of having ever existed? And what is more extraordinary, that this should happen when we have so many writings of the first Christians still extant? He that can believe that such things can so wholly die away, may believe that all the original story of Christianity has died away; and that what we now read in the sacred writings is another story which has stepped into its place! And if such belief were valid, there would be an end of the evidences of our religion.

"Whenever," it has been said,* "the revelation of a thing so unexpected as this must have been, was made to the disciples, their wonder and surprise must have been such as to leave some traces in their writings. Nor can it be supposed that a thing so wonderful as this could have been announced to the body of Christians, who certainly had not, at first, the most remote idea of it, without exciting an astonishment that could not have been concealed, and such speculations and debates as we must have heard of. And yet the Apostles, and the whole Christian world, are supposed to have passed, from a state of absolute ignorance concerning the nature of their Lord and Master (regarding him in the familiar light of a friend and brother), to the full conviction of his being the God of heaven and earth, without leaving any intimations by which it is possible for us to learn either in what manner so wonderful a communication was made to them, or what effects it had on their own minds, or on the minds of others."

Though Trinitarians are numerous, they are by no means one party, except in name; nor probably is the number of them that hold any one theory of the Trinity as great as the number of Unitarians. When they come to explain what they mean by the Trinity, there is no such thing as finding ten of their writers entirely of a mind. At the close of the seventeenth century it was reckoned that there were *forty* different Trinities which had been defended in writing. ("Unitarian Tracts," 4to., II.

i. 8—10). And it has since been observed that *ninety* different Trinities are to be made out of the different explanations that have been given even of only two words in the controversy, viz., "Nature" and "Person." (Taylor's "Ben Mordecai's Apology," ed. 1784, I. 66, 75, 84, 213).

And though Trinitarianism is now spread over so large a space of Christian ground, no one can read the Fathers of the Church without seeing what hard and long continued struggles it cost the monster to work its way. Though aided and abetted by the rulers of this world, it has been compelled to fight its way, inch by inch, and to carry on a contest from century to century. And never to this hour has it been left in quiet and undisturbed possession of any part of Christendom. So far is it from any pretensions to having been a well-known tenet commonly received and peaceably taught before even the writing of the New Testament!

No! the true way of accounting for those incidental expressions which theologians dislocate and torture in order to make them speak the language of their systems is by supposing, what all history confirms, that the doctrine was never known nor thought of till long after the New Testament was written.

Had the writers of that book been aware of the folly and absurdity of succeeding ages, they would have avoided applying to their Master the metaphors which theologians have misconstrued. Their thoughts and words were wholly moral, and never metaphysical or theological, and they had no more idea anybody would ever conceive that Jesus was Jehovah, than they had that any one could imagine that a piece of bread was literally "his body;" or that the Jews conceived him to be really Beelzebub (Matt. x. 25), or that Paul thought him to be really Adam (1 Cor. xv. 45). Even in this metaphorical sense it is only once, if at all, that the title of God is directly given to Jesus in the Scriptures. It is given oftener, and with more solemnity, to Moses. (See Exod. iv. 16, vii. 1; Deut. xxix. 6.) Some writers have indeed claimed further texts as instances of this title being given to Jesus. But they are merely

* Theological Repository, iii. 351.

inferences, not direct applications of it. And of inferences and deductions there is no end. The learned Postellus *inferred* that there were 11,000 proofs of the Trinity in the Old Testament alone, when interpreted as it ought to be, "*etymologico—mystico—cabalistically.*"

Indeed, Transubstantiation is not a jot more contradictory to reason than the Trinity is. Sir Isaac Newton* declared his belief that "the time will come when the doctrine of the Incarnation, as commonly received, will be exploded as an absurdity equal to transubstantiation." In fact, as to Scriptural evidence, Transubstantiation has greatly the advantage over the Trinity. The former was *directly* asserted in words in the Bible, once at any rate; the latter never at all. Add to this, that Transubstantiation is nowhere expressly contradicted in Scripture; but the deity of Jesus—on which the Trinity depends—is denied by the Apostles in terms as positive as can be conceived. For so long as John xvii. 3, 1 Cor. viii. 6, and Eph. iv. 6, stand in the Bible, it is impossible that the *Son* can be God, unless he be the *Father*, and that the Son is the Father is a flight that even Trinitarians do not soar to!

For high-church, orthodox, Trinitarians, who first forge, (or utter, knowing it to be forged), a creed without a word of Scripture in it, and then say, "If you do not thus think of the Trinity, you shall perish everlastingly," to censure Unitarians for not humbling themselves to receive instructions from Scripture, is perfectly ridiculous. This is playing the part of Father Paul in the Duenna, when "with rosy gills, round paunch, and greedy eye," he reprimands the half-starved porter for gormandising!

Professor Stuart said, "At least three quarters of my time have been spent among writers of the Unitarian class, from whom I have received, with gratitude, much instruction relative to the philology, the exegesis, and the literary history of the Scriptures."

* Among Unitarians are enrolled Newton, Locke, Chillingworth, Lord Falkland, Lardner; men who for powers of reasoning, for talents, for knowledge, for integrity, and for careful and diligent inquiry into the sense and meaning of Scripture, have never been exceeded.

LORD BYRON'S THEOLOGY.

TENS of thousands of the admirers of Lord Byron, who are now desirous of some stone monument to do him honour, would be happy if to his wonderful poetic genius they could add he was a pure-minded and religious man. He appears to have renounced religion. The cause is transparent. He was led to identify Christianity with Calvinism. How many have been led away from the simple, elevating, and consoling views of the Gospel by this unhappy confusion? Books, he says, were placed in his hands on Original Sin, the Trinity, Atonement, &c. &c. The influence of such literature could only tend to lead him, as it did, further astray. He unquestionably valued the Bible, for he says on one occasion:—"I know the Scriptures sufficiently well to acknowledge that if the mild and benignant spirit of this religion were believed and acted on by all, there would be a wonderful change in this wicked world." When asked on one occasion what were his difficulties about Christianity, he replied, "There is, for instance, the doctrine of the Trinity, which is alone quite appalling." What a stumbling-block this doctrine has been in all ages. Surely the Church will get rid of it soon. It is no doctrine of Christianity. The severe attacks on him also appear to have soured his temper, for he says, "I do not reject the doctrines of Christianity; I want only sufficient proofs of them to take up the profession in earnest, and I do not believe myself to be so bad a Christian as many of those who preach against me with the greatest fury, many of whom I have never seen nor injured. They furnish the suspicion of being latent hypocrites themselves, else why not use gentler and more Christian means."

The doctrine of an endless hell appears to have made him at times bitter against the Christian Church. Here is another false doctrine which has long proved a bane to religious belief. Some one sent him Dr. Southwood Smith on the "Divine Government." He said he liked this work. In conversation with his orthodox friend Dr. Kennedy, he observed about it, "The author

proves that the punishment of hell is not eternal—it will have a termination.” “They sent it out to me from England to make a convert of me, I suppose: the arguments he uses are strong. He draws them from the Bible itself, and by showing that a time will come when every intelligent creature shall be supremely happy, and eternally so, he expunges that shocking doctrine that sin and misery will for ever exist under the government of a God whose highest attribute is love and goodness; and thus, by removing one of the greatest difficulties, reconciles us to the wise and good Creator whom the Scriptures reveal.” “Nay,” he said, “that is not a strong argument, for a good God can permit sin to exist for a while, but will evince his goodness and power at last by rooting it all out and rendering all his creatures happy.” “Well, it proves the goodness of God, and is more consistent with the notions of our reason to believe that if God, for wise purposes, permitted sin to exist for a while, in order, perhaps, to bring about a greater good than could have been effected without it, His goodness will be more strikingly manifested in anticipating the time when every intelligent creature will be purified from sin and relieved from misery, and rendered permanently happy.” “Come,” said his lordship, “the author founds his belief on the very Scriptures themselves.” “You may find many passages in the Bible where the word everlasting or eternal signifies limited duration.” “But why are you so anxious to maintain and prove the eternity of hell punishments? It is certainly not a humane doctrine, and appears very inconsistent with the mild and benevolent doctrines of Christ.” “To my present apprehension it would be a most desirable thing, could it be proved, that ultimately all created beings were to be happy. This would appear most consistent with the nature of God, whose power is omnipotent, and whose principal attribute is love. I cannot yield to your doctrine of the eternal duration of punishment; this author’s opinion is more humane, and I think he supports it very strongly from Scripture.” When his friend attacked Dr. Southwood

Smith as a Socinian, Byron says, “You seem to hate the Socinians. Is this charitable? Why would you exclude a sincere Socinian from the hope of salvation? They draw their doctrine from the Bible. Their religion,” said his lordship, “seems to be spreading very much. Lady Byron is a great one among them, and much looked up to. She and I used to have a great many discussions on religion, and some differences arose from this point; but on comparing all the points together, I found that her religion was very similar to mine.”

We fear the last few words can only mean that he denied the doctrines which Lady Byron denied. Too many find their points of similarity in denial *only*. Lady Byron believed as well as denied. Lord Byron appears not to have believed much, and was far from happy in this state of negation. Dr. Kennedy says of him:—“With respect to religion, we find nothing like a settled enmity to it, or a settled conviction that it was an imposture.”—“He was, in fact, what he represented himself to be when I saw him, unsettled in his religious opinions. He rejected the appellation of infidel; he said it was a cold and chilling word. He confessed he was not happy; he said he wished to be convinced of the truth of religion.”

How incumbent therefore it becomes a Unitarian to endeavour to spread positive views of religion—of the Christian religion, apart from those strange and unreasonable doctrines which lead men like Lord Byron into the dark glen of unbelief and disregard of religion.

A WORD TO PARENTS.

THERE is a saying that old maids’ children and bachelors’ wives are always perfect. It is well. Would that married people’s wives and children were also perfect. But the world must see three or four more generations before that happy day arrives. “A little child shall lead them.” Even the little babe who has seen only a few months of life begins to say by actions rather than words, “My darling parents, who rules, you or I?” And the question will be decided long before the child knows anything of the meaning of the word obey. The little will which seems so cunning

at first, and is allowed to do so, grows stronger day by day, and baby wins. Is he to be blamed? I think not. In the parents' anxious care to provide all things necessary for the precious little body they forget how soon the mind begins to call for food and clothing, too. In the beginning the mind is like a sheet of paper on which nothing is written, and it is very much less difficult to write only good and true words than to erase the bad, once written. The child who never heard a bad word will never speak one, and if he has never been deceived, will never seek to deceive, therefore give him butter and honey that he may know to refuse the evil and choose the good. Never give a child anything because he cries for it. If it be a fitting and proper thing for him to have, don't wait for him to cry to obtain it. Let him have it cheerfully. If not, the sooner he learns to do without, the better for all. There is no need of a child's screaming himself into fits for everything he sees, and when he does, although I do not hold to frequent whipping, when there is danger of the fits becoming dangerous, a little stick well laid on is an excellent remedy. It may hurt a little for a while, but will save trouble by and by. Let the child have all the liberty possible. Who would make their children slaves? Yet some of the poor little things are the veriest slaves in existence to every whim of their parents. It is better, many times, to request a child to do as you wish, than to command, but a command once given requires strict obedience. Never threaten. A parent who will let a child disobey six times and punish him the seventh, deserves—well—he deserves to have a bad child. Above all things, when one parent is correcting a child let not the other interfere. It is hard for a mother, sometimes, who knows just how tender the flesh is, to keep quiet, but interference usually makes a bad matter worse. One who cannot be trusted with his own children better not be married. More might be said, but I leave the subject to those who have had more experience. The parent will be made to bitterly regret that does not retain an authority over his children. Nothing is more certain.

HINTS TO SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS.

(1.) REMEMBER that the attention of the older scholars must be won by *exciting their interest* in the subject.

(2.) Remember that they cannot be chided, commanded, or coerced as little children may sometimes be.

They must be taught as though you taught them not,
And things unknown proposed as things forgot.

(3.) Appoint beforehand one pupil to prepare a brief paper (three minutes long) on, say, "Lamentations at Oriental Funerals;" another, a definition in writing of "Ruler;" another, a very brief word-picture of the scene where the ruler presents himself to Jesus.

(4.) Each pupil should have a Bible. All should be encouraged to do or say something in the class—find and read a reference, indicate a locality, draw an inference, ask a question, supply an illustration, present a difficulty, advance an opinion, write a definition or essay, read a poem or expository extract, give a written outline of the lesson—or something else; but in a senior class the members must be set at work.

WHEN THE SONG'S GONE OUT OF YOUR LIFE.

"When the song's gone out of your life, you can't start another while it's a ringing in your ears, but it's best to have a bit of silence, and out of that maybe a psalm 'I'll come by-and-by.'"

WHEN the song's gone out of your life,

That you thought would last to the end:

That first sweet thought of the heart,

That no after days can lend—

The song of the birds to the trees,

The song of the wind to the flowers,

The song that the heart sings low to itself

When it wakes in life's morning hours.

"You can start no other song,"

Not even a tremulous note

Will falter forth on the empty air;

It dies in your aching throat.

It is all in vain that you try,

For the spirit of song has fled—

The nightingale sings no more to the rose

When the beautiful flower is dead.

O let silence softly fall

On the bruised heart's quivering strings;

Perhaps from the loss of all you may learn

The song that the seraph sings;

A grand and glorious psalm

That will tremble and rise and thrill,

And fill your breast with its grateful rest,

And its lonely yearnings still.

WAYSIDE GATHERINGS.

FRUGALITY.—It is better to live on a little than to outlive much.

YOUR OWN ENEMY.—"How many people," says Jeremy Taylor, "are busy in the world gathering together a handful of thorns to sit upon?"

GENTLEMEN.—An English judge has recently defined "gentleman" as a term which "includes anybody who has nothing to do and is outside of the workhouse."

PAINTERS' ORTHOGRAPHY.—Benjamin West painted better than he spelled, when he wrote Mr. Hopkinson, from London, that he was painting a picture for King George of "Young Haueble swaring at the altar," and signed it, "Aduē with asteem."

TEN POINTS OF A GOOD WIFE.—Robert Burns, the Scottish poet, speaking of the qualities of a good wife, divided them into ten parts. Four parts he gave to "good temper," two to "good sense," one to "wit," one to "beauty" (such as a sweet face, eloquent eyes, a fine person, a graceful carriage), and the remaining two parts he divided amongst other qualities belonging to or attending on a wife, such as fortune, connection or accomplishments, family and so on; but, he said, "divide those two parts as you please, remember that all these minor proportions must be expressed by fractions, for there is not any one of them that is entitled to the dignity of an integer."

THE SABBATARIAN.—The *Scotsman* furnishes us with the following illustration of the camel and gnat of religion of some of his countrymen; but it is quite as common here and everywhere else as in Scotland. A traveller says: "*Sunday morning at the hotel at Dumbarton, I had just got up and rung the bell for some hot water for shaving. A waiter answered my call. 'I want some hot water, if you please,' I said. 'And for what do you want the water?' 'For shaving,' I said. 'Ye canna have hot water on the Lord's day for sic a thing as shaving,' said the waiter, horror-struck at the idea. I insisted again, but with the same effect. 'Na, na,' said he, 'ye canna have it.' Necessity is the mother of invention 'tis said, and this aroused mine. I thought that if I could arrange this order in such a way that it would not affect his religious scruples he would bring it directly. I therefore proposed that I should take some *toddy*, and told him to bring me the material for making it, consisting of whiskey, sugar, and *boiling water*. These he brought without the least demur. I gave him the whiskey, which he drank, and I used the hot water."*

POWER OF GOODNESS.—The best way to condemn bad traits is by practising good ones.

DULL PREACHERS.—"Somesermonisers," said Sydney Smith, "preach as if sin were to be taken from men as Eve was from Adam, by casting them into a deep sleep."

WORK AND PRAYER.—A clergyman in Paris, Ky., stopped his prayer to lead an unruly man out by the ear, and went on: "As I was saying, O Lord."—*Independent*.

CARLYLE AND TYNDALL.—It is reported that when Carlyle read Tyndall's address before the British Association, he said, "That is a philosophy for dogs, not for men."

THE RIGHT TONE.—The venerable Rev. Lyman Beecher once told a young minister not to think too much about the tone of his voice, but to be in earnest. "No man," said he, "ever cried fire in the wrong tone when his own house was burning."

FRENCH JOKES.—The French keep up their little jokes. "An Alsatian woman goes to confess: 'Father, I have committed a great sin.' 'Well?' 'I dare not say it; it is too grievous.' 'Come, come, courage.' 'I have married a Prussian.' 'Keep him, daughter. That's your penance.'"

TREAT ANIMALS KINDLY.—Boys, here are four reasons why you should treat all dumb animals kindly: (1) They were created for the use of man by the same power that created man himself. (2) The humane and kind treatment of all animals under our control is one of our greatest sources of pleasure and happiness. (3) It is much more profitable, pecuniarily, to take good care and deal kindly with every creature God hath given us. (4) Cruel treatment of animals is a sin and transgression which will surely be punished sooner or later.

The following are the terms for supplying the CHRISTIAN FREEMAN and RECORD OF UNITARIAN WORTHIES, post free:—

	s.	d.
1 copy, per year	2	0
2 copies "	3	6
3 " "	5	6
5 " "	6	0

Thirty copies and upward at 1d. per copy, post free.

Communications to be addressed to the Rev. R. SPEARS, 19, Mornington-road, Bow-road, London, E.

Printed by GEORGE REVEIRS, successor to SAMUEL TAYLOR, Graystoke-place, Fetter-lane, London, and the trade supplied by EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178, Strand, London.